

The Master Musician is Dead



[Copyright, 1916, by John T. McCutcheon. Reproduced by courtesy of Chicago Tribune.]

THE CHILDREN'S POET

[Address delivered by William Jennings Bryan at Miami, Florida, February 25, 1916, at the James Whitcomb Riley Day exercises.]

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Riley, Children, Friends: It seems an intrusion for grown-up people to take part in these exercises, and I shall not violate the proprieties by trespassing long upon your time. This is Riley Day and the children are his hosts; all the children belong to Riley, and Riley belongs to them. You have just heard him described as chief among the song birds; perhaps that explains his migration to Florida. Like the other song birds, he divides his time between the north and the south in order that he may sing the year round.

I ask your attention while I speak two words, one personal and one as your representative. My children were brought up on Riley food, and I hereby acknowledge the family's indebtedness to him. My wife has whiled away many an evening hour reading his homely and wholesome rhymes to those who are to carry our blood down through the years to come. Our son — who knows how many pitfalls he might have stumbled into had he not been warned away by "The goblins will get you if you don't watch out" — was especially fond of Dr. Riley's writings, so much so that, when a few years ago, the eminent author honored us with a set of his works, we inscribed on the fly leaf of the first volume, "with remainder over to Wm. Jennings Bryan, Jr.," and the books will go from our library to his in recognition of this early attachment.

And now, Dr. Riley, a word from the audience to you. I do not know whom you had in mind when you immortalized the words "Good-bye Jim, take care of yourself." If it was your father's parting advice, you have obeyed it to the letter; you have taken care of yourself by devoting yourself to others—the only really effective way. Your life has proven anew that truth of the proverb: "There is a scattering that increaseth." You have made a success of life—such a success as few of your generation have achieved.

Your name is not found in the list of our multi-millionaires, but you have secured what all their money can not buy—that "loving favor" which is rather to be chosen "than silver and gold."

The blue books do not record your name among the great legislators of the nation, but this need not disturb you, for you are entitled to the distinction embodied in the words "Let me write the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws."

You do not claim a place among the great warriors of the world, and yet you, the "Hero of the Nursery," are the commander-in-chief of a larger army than any general ever led, and those who follow you know not the cruel clamor of war or the mingled miseries of the battlefield, but rather the joy of innocence and the laughter of youth.

You are not of the royal company of kings,

and yet you reign with undisputed sway over the twilight hours.

You have never aspired to the presidency of the United States, and yet without arousing the animosities of a campaign you have won a victory nation-wide. I constitute myself the messenger of the masses to inform you that, at an election where all could vote, you have been unanimously chosen to preside in the hearts of the children of America—chosen for life, and to live in memory forever after.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Commoner readers are responding generously to the appeal for contributions for the democratic national campaign fund. Below are some of the letters received:

F. A. Guice, Douglas, Ariz.: Enclosed find money order for \$5.00 — democratic campaign contribution. As the democrats promoted the policy of publishing contributions of large sums before election, I feel it my duty to assist with a small amount, hoping some progressive plan will be framed to carry on election without campaign funds.

Jas. Ryan, New Holland, Ill.: Enclosed find check for \$1 for the campaign fund.

Ira Howard, Dakota City, Nebr.: \$1.00, campaign fund.

Joseph Pollek, McPherson, Kans.: Herewith contribution of \$2.00 for democratic campaign fund.

Peter Kohler, Tekamah, Nebr.: I hand you herewith \$1.00 contribution for the democratic campaign fund.

Spencer F. Ball, Terre Haute, Ind.: Enclosed please find check for \$5.00, my subscription to the Wilson campaign fund. With the same leaders, Wilson and Bryan, as in 1912 we can not fail to win in 1916.

Mrs. Sarah von Ehrenberg, Buffalo, N. Y.: Please accept toward the campaign of the democratic party the enclosed post office money order for \$25.00, which may be used—you to find the distributor — in disseminating the ideas of the party as expressed in its platform adopted at the recent national convention, and contained with many other exceptionally good campaign articles in the June number of The Commoner.

J. L. Nash, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Herewith \$1.00 contribution to the campaign fund, as announced in the last issue of The Commoner.

A. W. Hammond, Amsterdam, Va.: I am enclosing my pittance as suggested by Colonel Bryan which apply to the democratic campaign fund. If every democratic voter will contribute \$1.00, Mr. Wilson's committee will have plenty of money and the party will not be under obligations to any large contributor.

I. J. Lucas, Junction City, Oreg.: Please send the enclosed \$1.00 contribution to the democratic national committee for use in the coming campaign.

Henry Diener, Washington, Calif.: Enclosed please find check for \$1.00 as my contribution to the democratic campaign fund. It seems to be a dollar well spent.

F. A. Lucas, Junction City, Oreg.: The enclosed \$1.00 is my contribution to the democratic campaign fund.

Bernard Greenburg, Milwaukee, Wisc.: Please accept my contribution to the campaign fund—\$5.00 money order enclosed. It is the first \$5.00 I have given for such a purpose, but I feel justified in doing so. I have reached the conclusion to let well enough alone. I am a man who sympathizes with what is good and true, and therefore will stand with the man who is most God fearing. I am only a plain laboring man, but I love my adopted country too dearly to be indifferent to the evil forces in many guises—whose day I pray may be short. May the Lord of peace, harmony and strength guide and shield our beloved president into continued well doing.

J. H. Cohen, Sioux City, Ia. Enclosed find \$2.00 for democratic campaign fund. Send extra copies of the June issue of The Commoner.

W. S. Olson, Redondo Beach, Calif.: Please find enclosed by check for \$2.00 to apply on the democratic campaign fund. How I thank God for the record of the democratic administration.

FAKE "HOME RULE"

The liquor interests of Michigan are attempting the same fraud on the farmers of that state that was perpetrated two years ago on the farmers of Ohio. They are trying to overthrow county option and they are using a false flag; they shout "home rule" to deceive the people. THEY EXPECT TO USE THE WET VOTE IN

A FEW CITIES TO DISFRANCHISE THE FARMERS IN THE COUNTIES. WILL THEY ALLOW THE COUNTIES TO DECIDE FOR THEMSELVES whether they shall have the county unit? No. The liquor interests rely on a FEW wet counties to take home rule from a LARGE NUMBER of dry counties. They say they want "home rule" for the towns—but they do not ask the right to sell to the people of the town. Oh, no. They want the towns to license saloons TO SELL TO THE PEOPLE OUTSIDE OF THE TOWNS. Under the pretense of "home rule" they are attempting to FORCE THE SALE OF LIQUOR INTO DRY TERRITORY AND AMONG FARMERS WHO ARE TO BE DENIED A VOTE ON THE QUESTION. The saloon does not dare to make an honest fight. It always resorts to fraud and deception.

Popular Election of Senators

In 1892, the democratic house of representatives, elected in 1890, passed a joint resolution submitting an amendment to the federal constitution providing for the popular election of United States senators. This was the first congressional action taken toward the securing of this great reform. A similar resolution was passed by the house of representatives, also democratic, in the following congress. After passing four more times through the house of representatives it passed the senate in 1912, and was rapidly ratified by the states, so that on May 31, 1913 it became a part of the constitution of the United States.

While no party can claim the entire credit for the adoption of a constitutional amendment—since it requires the support of two-thirds of both houses of congress and ratification by three-fourths of the states — still it is worth while to note: 1st, That it was a democratic house that first approved the policy. 2nd, That the proposed amendment was indorsed in the democratic national platforms of 1900, 1904, and 1908, while it was ignored by the republican national conventions of 1900 and 1904, AND WAS REJECTED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN TO ONE IN THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1908.

The amendment was submitted to the states before the democratic national convention of 1912 was held but the democratic platform of that year URGED THE RATIFICATION, while the republican national platform was silent on this subject.

It will be seen, therefore, that the democratic party has shown itself the constant friend of popular election of senators while the REPUBLICAN LEADERS HAVE DONE LITTLE OR NOTHING TO AID THIS EPOCH MAKING REFORM. THE MASSES of all parties have favored this reform, as they do all reforms increasing the people's power over the government.

W. J. BRYAN.

"PORK" AT WHOLESALE ONLY

The following quotation is from Mr. Hughes's speech at Chicago:

"I don't care, if I am elected president, what becomes of my personal political fortunes. I propose that we shall have government in a business-like way. We won't have any more, if I can stop it, of these 'kiss me and I'll kiss you' appropriations in congress."

Now this is some promise. Is he going to REFORM and cease to look after his "personal political fortunes"? Who has surpassed him in looking after his "personal political fortunes" in the past?

"I don't want any hot air in mine." Who has ever made hotter speeches? "I propose that we shall stop this pork business," and yet his policy means more "pork" for munition manufacturers than they have ever had before, more pork for the railroads, more pork for the shipping trust, more pork for the industrial trusts, more pork for the tariff barons, more pork for the exploiters in Latin America. Congressmen must not look for appropriations for their districts—appropriations for rivers and harbors and for public buildings. No, there will be no retail pork—it will be WHOLESALE pork and that used to pay political debts to the plunderbund.